To anyone familiar with the general pattern of distribution of Soviet industry, the results of this mapping of employment data are fairly predictable. The author, now a project director of the Computer-Assisted Education Curriculum Program at the University of California, Irvine, traces industrial employment from its prewar concentration in the European USSR, particularly the Central Region and the Ukraine (Donbas), through the wartime eastward movement, to the continuing concentration in the west after the war. To readers less familiar with the situation the multiplicity of maps and tables and the style of textual discussion may prove confusing. A sentence, taken at random, goes: "There are still eight *sovnarkhozy* with lower ratios surrounding Moscow (4 per cent or less, the median ratio in 1955 being 6 per cent), while all of Kazakhstan and Central Asia have the ratios below the median" (p. 82). One comes away with the impression of a statistical exercise in the tabular and cartographic presentation of percentage changes of employment indicators.

Stanley points out that employment in machine manufacturing alone, which he uses as a case study, correlates well with the general pattern of industrialization. It can be inferred that a study limited to this branch of industry might have yielded a clearer picture of the general distribution of Soviet industry than the painstaking sector-by-sector analysis.

For his areal units the author uses both the *sovnarkhozy* (or regional industrial management areas) of 1957–65 and the system of fourteen major economic regions that was abandoned by Soviet planners in 1961. Of course, any regional pattern for which data were available is justified as a framework of presentation. But the reader should have been clearly alerted that the *sovnarkhozy* no longer exist and that the old system of economic regions has been overhauled. Only in one of the appendixes is casual mention made of a "1963 division into seventeen major economic regions" without indication that this system officially replaced the network of fourteen regions used in the study.

Chapter 10, "Communist Doctrine and Economic Geography," seems oddly out of step with the rest of the book, as if it had been added as an afterthought. In it, Stanley polemicizes with Soviet scholars, particularly Iu. G. Saushkin, a Moscow University economic geographer, on the grounds that they still engage in sloganeering ("the future belongs to socialism") and thus give "little hope that a basic change in their thinking has occurred in the post-Stalin era." The literature would, on the contrary, suggest that the thinking of Soviet economic geographers has undergone a marked change indeed, especially when it comes to analysis of the constraints imposed on economic development by a harsh environment, as in Siberia. Ample evidence of this trend could have been gleaned from the journal *Soviet Geography: Review and Translation*, from which some material for the study was derived.

THEODORE SHABAD
American Geographical Society
and the *New York Times*

SOVIET ECONOMIC CONTROVERSIES: THE EMERGING MARKETING CONCEPT AND CHANGES IN PLANNING, 1960–1965. By *Jere L. Felker*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: M.I.T. Press, 1966. xi, 172 pp. $5.95.

Soviet economic controversies puzzle Western economists because an alien technical jargon is used, because it is hard to determine when issues are analytical and when

they are about differences in policy objectives, and because Soviet authors frequently must be elliptical in order to publish at all. A Western study may place some Soviet economic controversy into a general Soviet intellectual context, or it may regard the controversy as a stage in the history of Soviet economics, or it may analyze the controversy in terms of Soviet economic policy or modern economics. These approaches will endear the author, respectively, to historians of Soviet intellectual thought, historians of Soviet economics, historians of Soviet economic policy, and analytical economists.

Felker's discussion will interest historians of Soviet economics a good deal, historians of Soviet intellectual life and economic policies somewhat, and analytical economists not at all. It is essentially an account of events along the frontier separating the policy-oriented wing of Soviet academic economics and the intellectually oriented wing of the Soviet economic administration. A corresponding controversy in the United States would involve, say, academic economists like Ackley, Friedman, Heller, and Musgrave on the one hand, and government economists of the Federal Reserve Board and the Executive Branch on the other.

The analytical economist, reading of a policy controversy, would be interested in "where the truth of the matter lay"; he would want to know the circumstances in which each of the arguments might be valid. Consequently, he would be disappointed in Felker's discussion. It deals with several proposed redefinitions of the objectives to be pursued by Soviet managers (and of the basis for cash rewards to managers). The author could have analyzed the consequences of each set of objectives and evaluated the validity of positions of the contestants. Such analysis would have added to our understanding of economic systems and would have interested a group of economists broader than the Sovietologists. This group would like to know the consequences of new forms of economic organizations and is reluctant to accept obiter dicta, whether of Soviet or Western origin.

EDWARD AMES
State University of New York, Stony Brook

OPYT SOTSIOLOGICHESKOGO IZUCHENIIA SELA. By *Iu. V. Arutiunian.* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1968. 104 pp. 42 kopeks, paper.

This book reports and interprets the results of a sociological study conducted in the large Ukrainian village of Terpene, Melitopol Raion, Zaporozhe Oblast, and in certain outlying settlements. The population studied included kolkhozniks, sovkhoz workers, blue-collar industrial workers (chiefly employed in a lime works), and white-collar workers employed in various government agencies and in the trade and cultural spheres. The study concentrated on economic matters—income, consumption, the size and role of the "personal" economy among various groups in the population. Indirectly the study deals with such touchy and (for Soviet social science) unusual topics as social stratification and the pathways and limitations of social mobility. The population is divided not—as has been customary in Soviet social science writing—according to "relationship to the means of production" (i.e., workers versus kolkhozniks), but according to the character of labor. Labor is divided as follows: (1) skilled mental, usually requiring higher education; (2) unskilled mental (white-collar); (3) skilled physical; (4) unskilled physical. The reporting and interpretation of data is preceded by a section which reviews critically the history of Russian and Soviet "rural sociology" and rejects much of it. The